## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

## **Docket No. 36421**

| STATE OF IDAHO,                              | 2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 413             |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff-Respondent,                        | Filed: April 1, 2010                         |
| <b>v.</b>                                    | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk                     |
| JOSE CONCEPCION MENDOZA-PINEDA,)             | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| Defendant-Appellant.                         | BE CITED AS AUTHORITY                        |
| Appeal from the District Court of the Fourtl | n Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada     |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of twenty-six years, with a minimum period of confinement of five and one-half years, for sexual battery of a minor child sixteen or seventeen years of age, <u>affirmed</u>.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Sara B. Thomas, Chief Appellate Unit, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge; and MELANSON, Judge

## PER CURIAM

Jose Concepcion Mendoza-Pineda pled guilty to sexual battery of a minor child sixteen or seventeen years of age. I.C. § 18-1508A. The district court sentenced Mendoza-Pineda to a unified term of twenty-six years, with a minimum period of confinement of five and one-half years. Mendoza-Pineda appeals.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App.

1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Mendoza-Pineda's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.